

any extension of time fees, applicant hereby expressly requests any required extension of time, and authorizes the commissioner to charge any required fee, including any required extension of time fee, to deposit Account No. **08-1800**.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for restriction are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks:

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application and are subject to a restriction requirement. Claims 1 and 36 are independent claims.

SPECIES ELECTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner has required election of species to one of the following species under 35USC121:

- I. Claims 1 and 36, drawn to a household product composition,
- II. Claims 5, 6, and 32, drawn to species comprising solvents,
- III. Claims 1, 8-13, and 34-36, drawn to species comprising hydrophobically modified polysaccharide, and
- IV. Claims 18-20, 23-31, and 33, drawn to species comprising cleaning products.

ELECTION

In order to be responsive to the requirement for restriction, applicant elects the species as set forth as follows:

- I. Claim 1.
- II. Claim 5, directed to a solvent or solvent mixture selected from the group consisting of water, water-lower alkanol mixtures, polyhydric alcohols and mixtures thereof.

- III. Claim 8, directed to the definition of hydrophobically modified polysaccharide backbone as being a select group of cellulose ethers as well as other polysaccharide materials.
- IV. Claim 19, directed to liquid soap product.

TRAVERSE

Notwithstanding the election of the claims as mentioned above, in order to be responsive to the restriction, election of species, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

Initially, applicants points out that the requirement for restriction omits one of the two criteria of a proper requirement as now established by the US Patent and Trademark Office policy, as set forth in MPEP 803, viz that "an appropriate explanation" must be advanced by the Examiner as to the existence of a "serious burden" if a restriction was not required. Due to the aforementioned omission, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for restriction is improper and consequently, its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Related to this, the requirement is traversed since there would not appear to be a serious burden to examine applicant's application in total, and for which he has paid the appropriate claims fees. Applicant submits that it would be no serious burden for the Examiner to examine all of the pending claims, because a search for all of the claims in the above identified application, should be made in order to do a complete and thorough search in view of the recognized relationship between the claims in groups I - IV as mentioned above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner seriously reconsiders the requirement for restriction, and withdraws the same so as to give an examination under merits of all of the claims pending in this application.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's requirement for restriction, election of species, is improper and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the requirement for the restriction with the examination of all claims pending in this application is respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration with early allowance of claims is most urgently solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, or wishes to discuss this matter, please call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,



David Edwards
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,293

Hercules Incorporated
Hercules Plaza
1313 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19894-0001

(302) 594-6974

May 26, 2000

a:\Elect w traverse.doc